

REMARKS

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to a non-statutory carrier wave. To simplify prosecution issues, claims 16-18 are canceled without prejudice.

The remaining claims are rejected in view of AYERS (U.S. Patent 6,353,924) and MANN (U.S. Patent 6,314,530). Reconsideration of the rejection in view of the following comments is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites “one or more user trace write commands, wherein a user trace write command instructs a processor to write user trace data to a user trace data register”. The Examiner argues that AYERS teaches a user trace data register at Column 4, Lines 10-13 and Column 5, Lines 1-3.

Column 4, Lines 5-16 of AYERS state: “In an optimized embodiment using path encoding, a block identifier is recorded in a condensed representation. Alternatively, a few bits can be used to encode the direction taken by the program at each branch, e.g., one bit for each two-way branch. The condensed representation can hold a plurality of block identifiers. The condensed representation can be stored, for example, in a register which reduces the number of instructions added for each block. The register value is stored into memory when no more values can be written to it. The condensed representation is then expanded by a post-processing step by storing the individual block identifiers contained therein into the trace record.” This teaching in AYERS relates to path encoding using block identifiers in a condensed representation. AYERS does not show or suggest user trace write commands that instruct a processor to write user trace data to a user trace data register. AYERS merely refers to a “register”, which stores a “condensed representation” of path encoding information, not “user trace data”.

Column 5, Lines 1-3 of AYERS state: “In another embodiment, sequence indicators are stored only when a specified event, which is preferably selected by a user, is detected by the instrumentation code.” This teaching does not show or suggest “one or more user trace write commands, wherein a user trace write command instructs a processor to write user trace data to a user trace data register.”

The Examiner acknowledges that “Ayers doesn’t expressly disclose each said user trace write command being a standard write command without trace code information identifying the type of data to be traced and detecting a write to at least part of said user trace data register and in response to said detected write, generating a trace record that includes at least part of the user

trace data in said user trace data register.” There are a number of significant limitation here. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that “Ayers does mention that the instrumentation code is able to record or write out the trace information using the block identifiers and sequence information (Ayers, 6:50-53, see instrumentation code 304 records or writes out).” This limited teaching does not show or suggest the limitations identified by the Examiner. Thus, this basis for rejecting the claim in view of AYERS is inappropriate.

The Examiner indicates that “Mann discloses in an analogous art and similar configuration that the trace access instruction can be a write instruction (4:16-19)....” As discussed in previous responses, in MANN, trace data is always accompanied by a trace code (see, e.g., column 13 of MANN, which specifies a trace code (TCODE) and trace data (TDATA)). Independent claim 1 specifies that such a code does not exist in the claimed invention and is therefore outside the scope of MANN. MANN does not show or suggest a user trace write command that is a standard write command without trace code information identifying the type of data to be traced. Thus, the combination of MANN and AYERS fails to show or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 should be in a condition for allowance. Claims 2-7 are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore should also be in a condition for allowance. Claim 8 includes limitations of the type described in connection with claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-14 should also be in a condition for allowance. Claim 15 also includes limitations of the type discussed in connection with claim 1. Therefore, claim 15 should also be in a condition for allowance.

In sum, all pending claims should now be in a condition for allowance. If there are any residual issues that need to be resolved prior to allowing the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Dated: **June 26, 2006**

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663
730051 v1/PA

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By: _____

William S. Galliani
Reg. No. 33,885